

to our American family is not in the best interests of fairness and decency and compassion.

Let us pray for those who have the most in our society, that they will get to this President and say: Mr. President, we have enough. We don't need any more. We need to pay our fair share. We don't need these two new tax cuts that are coming down next year. Take those off the table. Let's have shared sacrifice for all in our society.

And maybe those who the President listens to the most, the rich and the powerful, maybe if they could get to him with a change of heart, then maybe we can change our priorities. Maybe rather than praying for the poor, we ought to be praying for the rich to have that change of heart, to talk to this President, to talk to the leaders in Congress about fairness and equity and justice for the least in our society.

That is what a budget is about. It is not numbers. It is about who gets and who doesn't. It is about what kind of a structure our country will have. It is about hope. It is about giving hope to those who have the least—that they, too, can have a brighter future; that they, too, are members of our family; that they, too, are valuable. And while these poor kids in Head Start don't have a rich parent to get them into a private school, to get them tutoring, who do they rely on for their kids to get that Head Start? They rely upon us—the Government—because they don't have a rich parent or a rich uncle. So, yes, this Government can give hope to people—not just the wealthiest but to those on the bottom. That is what this budget is about and that is why I intend to challenge the President on this budget, to make sure we have our priorities right.

#### TURNING UP THE HEAT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I noticed a plethora of articles recently about the Republican National Committee turning up the heat on Minority Leader HARRY REID. I notice here that there is some other stuff coming out from the Republican National Committee saying they are going to "Daschleize" REID, making HARRY REID, our minority leader, the obstructionist.

Again, this is not what working together means. Look, we Democrats are in the minority. I believe we are the loyal opposition. We need to provide a different view for the American people. This last election was very close. There is no mandate for one side or the other to run roughshod over the other. This is a mandate for us to try to get together and work things out. It is not a mandate for the Republican National Committee to trash, demonize, and drag down the good name of Senator HARRY REID of Nevada. But that is what is happening. It has no part here. I was hoping maybe we would be beyond that. I would think we are beyond that.

I have known our minority leader for the last 30 years. He is a good, decent, kind human being. He is tough, but we expect him to be tough in making sure our rights are protected, and making sure the debate flows in the Senate, so we are able to come together and work things out, with having the President of the United States say this is the way it is going to be and you have to follow suit. That is not the way our country works; it is not the way the Senate works.

I am hopeful the RNC will look into their own hearts and see that this is not the right way to do things. It is going to make it tougher to get things done around here. It is going to make it much tougher if the Republican National Committee continues to try to drag down Senator HARRY REID, demonize him, call him an obstructionist, and to "Daschleize" him—whatever that means. I guess it means to make Senator REID the object of scorn for the Republican National Committee. I hope the Republicans in this body will tell the RNC to back off. This is not the way we do things around here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RETAINING CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE LABOR, HHS, AND EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in a few moments we are going to be moving to the class action bill. Senator DURBIN is due to arrive to offer an amendment. In the intervening time, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss my decision to retain the chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. The Appropriations Committee has been considering the formation of a new subcommittee on intelligence. Under my seniority position, I would have been in a position to take that subcommittee assignment. I have had a very keen interest in intelligence, chairing the Senate Intelligence Committee in the 104th Congress, being coauthor of the homeland security bill, and the fight against terrorism is obviously our No. 1 priority. So, I have been very strongly tempted to take on that chairmanship.

It now appears that the status of that subcommittee is in doubt because the decision has been made to not make a disclosure of the total funding for the intelligence community. With the announcement of the President's budget, which is austere, we are facing major problems with the deficit and the President has come in with a very re-

stricted budget, which impacts very heavily on the subcommittee that I have chaired now for many years.

The Department of Labor, for example, has cut some \$400 million; the Department of Health and Human Services has been cut by \$1.8 billion; the Department of Education cut by some \$500 million. So that the total impact on the subcommittee has been a reduction of \$2.4 billion, which is very difficult when you are talking about education and health and capital investments. Those are not expenditures, they are capital investments—as are programs related to worker safety.

The President has proposed some programs that are excellent. There is \$45 million for a new gang youth initiative, which has been sponsored and spoken about by First Lady Laura Bush. There is \$125 million for health care information technology, which is an increase of \$25 million. This is funding the subcommittee had started some time ago to enhance technology and information. We have had an increase in community health centers of about \$304 million. There is a new program for high school risk initiatives, for high school students who are at risk.

At the same time, there have been major eliminations. For example, the so-called GEAR UP program, which provides for the transition from the seventh grade on through high school, has been cut by more than \$306 million. The vocational and technical education programs have been cut by \$1.3 billion. Educational Technology State Grants have been cut by \$496 million, and correctional educational programs have been cut by \$26.8 million. There have also been major decreases in training; some \$333 million is cut from employment and training programs; \$29 million is cut from the Job Corps; \$35 million from a program for ex-offenders has been eliminated.

There has been a decrease in Healthy Start. The Centers for Disease Control has been cut by \$555 million, which is a little hard to understand at a time when we are calling on the CDC to undertake so many new actions. The program for low-income home energy assistance—a very vital program, especially for seniors who have to make decisions on limited compensation as to whether they will heat or eat—has been cut by some \$182 million. Graduate medical education has had a decrease of \$101 million. Perhaps of greatest concern—and it is hard to prioritize these cuts—has been the budget proposed by the administration for the National Institutes of Health, which has an increase of one-half of 1 percent, which will not maintain the research program of NIH.

I am joined on the floor by my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, who has been with me as chair of the subcommittee for more than a decade. Senator HARKIN and I have established what might be referred to as and others have called a model for bipartisan cooperation. We have had